

MINUTE ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case Name: **Darren Chaker v. Leesa Fazal, et al.** Case Number: **16-cv-1872-CAB-(BLM)**

Hon. Cathy Ann Bencivengo Ct. Deputy Lori Hernandez Rptr Tape: n/a

On May 4, 2018, the Court issued a Discrepancy Order that permitted Plaintiff's Emergency Ex Parte Motions to Seal to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received. [Doc. Nos. 63, 64.] The Court considered Plaintiff's request and concluded that although sealing the entire docket was not justified, certain documents contained sensitive information that warranted their sealing. [Doc. No. 66.] Accordingly, the Court ordered that documents 3, 4, 18, 31, 35, 36, 53 and 65 were to be sealed. [*Id.*]

Subsequently, Plaintiff submitted a second set of Emergency Ex Parte Motions, dated April 30, 2018, one of which he lodged under seal. [Doc. Nos. 68, 69.] The motions are substantially similar to his earlier requests and also request that documents 5, 6, 22, 25, 53.1 on the docket be filed under seal. [*Id.*] Having reviewed the documents at issue, the Court finds that a majority of the documents contain sensitive information that warrant their sealing. Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** that documents 6, 22, 25, 53.1 are to be **SEALED** in their entirety. Having previously sealed documents 3, 4, 18, 31, 35, 36, and 53 the request as to these documents is **DENIED as MOOT**. Further, the Court finds no reason that would justify sealing document 5 and therefore **DENIES** Plaintiff's request as to this document. Relatedly, the Court finds no reason why the Supplemental Emergency ExParte Motion to Seal Records [Doc. No. 69] should be filed under seal, and therefore **DENIES** the request to file this document under seal.

Finally, Plaintiff is cautioned that this case is **CLOSED** and any further filings in this matter will be rejected.

Date: May 9, 2018

Initials: NOD